THE NEW REPUBLIC

Let Us Begin

"Now the trumpet summons us again – not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need – not as a call to battle – though embattled we are – but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation' – a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself. . . . I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it."

JOHN F. KENNEDY
January 20, 1961

January 30, 1961, 25

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT
LIBRARY
BURLINGTON VT
12-61 H21402 ARB-18

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T.R.B. from Washington

The Spendthrift

★ Kennedy has started to wreck the Treasury; his very first executive order, too. He's going to make more surplus food available to the four million needy. Yes, sir, it's the kind of thing we feared! Eisenhower always knew where to draw the line – 5 cents per person a day, fiscal responsibility; 10 cents, Democratic deficit financing. Eisenhower's heart bled for the poor but *he put first things first*. The new Kennedy order will jump monthly costs from $9 million to $15 million. How you going to balance the budget with extravagance like that? It's a grim prospect, folks!

It was an Inaugural we'll never forget. But let's go back a bit. In four separate Eisenhower statements – State of the Union, Budget, Economic Report and final press conference – he said the economy is in good shape. "Economic activity continues at a high level." That was the watchword.

Eisenhower assistants elaborated this: "I believe it is bad psychology to use the word 'recession'," said Raymond Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. "A few statements of confidence on the part of the next Administration would do more for the economy than a few billion dollars of defense spending," said Budget Director Stans, acidly.

So, when Kennedy took over, December industrial activity had slumped for the fourth time in five months, a skid of seven index points since midyear; December personal income turned down to a seasonally adjusted rate $2.3 billion below the revised November level; and unemployed estimates were 5.5 million – highest since the 40's.

Eisenhower's farewell TV address carried a strange final warning: against the power of the Pentagon or, as he put it, "the military-industrial complex." We couldn't have agreed more and yet (comically enough) a man's agreement rarely irritated us so much. He had eight years to give this warning; why wait till a minute before midnight? Again and again the Pentagon (it seems to us) made policy – on disarmament; right now, on aiding Laos! There is tremendous truth in what Eisenhower said; had he just discovered it? – why had he remained silent? it is a mystery.

The High Price of Ike

★ We won't know the real cost to America of the Eisenhower Era for years yet. *McCall's* magazine, just out, has a revealing piece by Robert Gray, Eisenhower's secretary to the Cabinet, showing how Sherman Adams shielded Ike, and how the latter's desire for "protection" from distasteful problems caused failure to act swiftly on the 1957-58 recession and Sputnik.

Again, Eisenhower in his State of the Union speech scornfully called the so-called missile gap a "fiction" (nonexistent presumably, as the recession!). Maybe so. We pray so! But military-foreign affairs pundit Henry A. Kissinger, research director for a Council on Foreign Relations panel, in his scarey new book, *The Necessity for Choice*, says the gap's here. For the next four years, he says, the Soviet Union will "possess more missiles than the US" – a potentially decisive factor against us in our crucial power to deter.

Like the awakening Rip van Winkle, America will take a little while now to discover what happened in the last eight years while it slept.

Night before Inauguration

★ The Inaugural was fun. We shall never forget it. We were trapped in a downtown office and slept on a couch wondering fitfully through the night how 40 bands march through seven inches of snow. We had always visualized a big city office as deserted after midnight. On the contrary! All through the night people came, unlocked the doors, turned on the lights, discovered our recumbent form, mumbled "Sorry!" and fled. Charwomen, watchmen, telegraph operators, unknown people, burglars – it was practically a main thoroughfare. Down below in the howling gale outside came the noise of snowplows. Came the frigid dawn and the snow had passed, and by some miracle and tons of rock salt, Pennsylvania Avenue was black and clear in a world of white.

We heard Kennedy give his speech – every smoking word of it – under the great dome. Since we were a little boy our feet haven't been so exquisitely cold. They were firmly planted in a snowdrift that extended under every pine press table. The four prayers were hardest to take. Cardinal Cushing addressed God severely, we thought, as one who implied he knew who was responsible, and would take no nonsense. A thing to watch was egg-bald Speaker Rayburn, forced to remove silk top hat for prayers and the Star Spangled Banner but still trying to get some shelter from the numbing wind by holding the silly silk stovepipe to the left of his pink skull.

All for One

★ Suddenly, as Robert Frost poignantly failed in his lines, the whole strange ceremony fused into unity – the unity of generous feeling welling out unaffectedly and transcending all the flummery. Then Kennedy spoke. For once he read slowly and effectively.

After that, for three and a half hours the preposterous parade trooped by. We found ourselves at the twilight end right across from the White House reviewing stand. One little knot of a crowd was left, solacing itself by beating its arms and cheering lustily everything that passed. Surprised governors would hear their first names – or nicknames – suddenly raised in an affectionate shout and would rise from open cars to bow gratefully. The streetlights went on. More bands, and more. We could see Kennedy across the street still cheerfully lifting his top hat or applauding. Finally the float of "Guam" came by. A great wave of emotion for Guam rose in us. It was the last. How we cheered Guam! I shall never feel the same about Guam again. By the way, where is it?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW REPUBLIC *A Journal of Opinion Volume 144 Number 5 Issue 2412 January 30, 1961*
Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed by The New Republic, *1244 19th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Phone: FEderal 8-2494. Single copy 25c. Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00, Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Advertising rates upon request. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Include old and new address.* *Copyright© 1961, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc.* *Item g. Second class Imprint, reading Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C.*

Let Us Begin

THE WEEK

3. Let Us Begin; Jurisdictional Lines; On the Last Day; McNamara's Gesture; Public Property

ARTICLES

8. Diem's One-Family War
by Denis Warner
10. The Superficial Aspect
by Gerald W. Johnson
11. Finger in the Space Pie
by Ronald Steel
13. Middle East
by Elizabeth Monroe
15. Thinking About Disarmament
by Jack Raymond

DEPARTMENTS

17. Books *21. Movies*
22. Theater

THE STAFF

Gilbert A. Harrison, Editor & Publisher
Helen Fuller, Managing Editor
Selig S. Harrison, Associate Editor
Robert Evett, Books & the Arts Editor
F. R. Ruskin, Assistant to the Publisher

Contributing Editors:
Alexander M. Bickel, Robert Brustein, Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Christopher Jencks, Gerald W. Johnson, Stanley Kauffmann Helen Hill Miller, Michael Straight

An early draft was headed: "John F. Kennedy – First Inaugural Address." And between the time the speech was released to the press on the evening before and the moment of delivery itself, many revisions had been made. But what was at last heard by millions on January 20 was altogether John F. Kennedy. It had that ring of command that emboldens men to renew their faiths; it had that intrepid assertiveness, that moral daring, that resourcefulness and self-confidence that is authentically American,

"effort, and expectation, and desire
And something evermore about to be."

The man and his spirit, rather than the ideas were new. And by his uttering them the ideas gained great expectations. There was Jefferson in Mr. Kennedy's evangelical assurance that "the energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it – and the glow from that fire can truly light the world." There was Woodrow Wilson, too, for the new President does not think moral example is enough; he promises that power and policies will be brought to bear to *make* the world safe for democracy. But where Wilson's thought centered on the forms of government and the rights of all peoples to self-determination, Mr. Kennedy speaks for a later generation that cannot separate political destinies from economic circumstances. And so, again and again, he emphasizes the long-term, costly but necessary mission to "assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty." And because, also, he is "born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace," he adds the reminder that not everything can be done soon. But he asks us to begin. To which the first Roosevelt would have said, "Bully!" He knows likewise that while this nation has a universal commitment to liberty, believing that all men are born free, the practical problems arise when this universal doctrine collides with an equally firm commitment to peace.

The address has been criticized as being no more than "mood music," though that is what an Inaugural Address is meant to be. In his State of the Union message and in subsequent proposals to the Congress, Mr. Kennedy will have occasion to define these large themes in detail. What, for example, Mr. Kennedy means by "a new alliance" of nations in this hemisphere remains to be seen. It also remains to be proved that the United Nations is "our last best hope," though it is a very great hope. It is questionable, too, whether the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russians wish to make the UN a "forum for invective." The more real danger may be that the United Nations becomes a consensus that is turned against our purposes, and is used to further an antithetic order, rather than disorder.

Others have remarked that Mr. Kennedy's address was in essence merely a pledge to fight the Cold War more intelligently. If that were all it is, that is not a negligible gain. But if his new frontier seems much like the old frontier, it can also be said that what has been missing in Washington is not new ideas, but the effective articulation and adoption of obvious ideas.

Is it true, however, that in his references to our need of military force "certain beyond doubt," to the right of neutrals to run their affairs without domination by great powers, to the interdependence of liberty and liberation from economic bondage, the new President said no more than his predecessors? It seems to us that the world he talked about is somewhat different from the one described to us for the past decade and a half. It is not, as we had been persuaded to believe, neatly divided into Communists, anti-Communists and neutrals, acting out a vast triangle play in which the anti-Communists and neutrals get together in the end in a heaven of licit bliss, with the Communists, reformed, coming over for Sunday visits. The division Mr. Kennedy postulates, rather subtle because it is one of spirit, is between those who think the world can be put together again in some kind of workable unity despite awesome contemporary stresses, and those who do not. The President, whether by instinct or conviction, is betting on a realistic proposition that the unifying forces in the world today are stronger than the divisive forces, and this is a proposition from which it has become a habit to recoil.

There is evidence enough for those who wish to disbelieve it, as in the nerve-wracking anarchy and intransigent nationalism so common in the present revolutionary stage of new independencies struggling to be states, and, at the other end of the scale, in the survival of the doctrine of inevitable conflict in recent statements of Mr. Khrushchev and of the Communist Chinese leaders. But Mr. Kennedy, aware in his own right of these current phenomena, has stronger support in a wider range of evidence from the incredible speed with which men can now communicate with each other and move about, to the practical restraints upon the USSR: the danger of nuclear war, the unwanted candidacies for the nuclear club, the budgetary burden of armaments, China's ambitions and perhaps the evolution of a new Soviet man with an increasing stake in an established order.

It is this fresh and more optimistic perspective on the world which gives Mr. Kennedy's Inaugural such claims as it has to greatness. And it opens the door to new opportunities which, one may assume, have not been lost on Mr. Khrushchev. The precept that "civility is not a sign of weakness" is richly illustrative. In seven words he took care of a problem which has bedeviled Presidents and restricted their freedom to negotiate for fear of seeming to appease. In a simple phrase, Mr. Kennedy achieved among other things a wholly satisfactory sublimation of the groping impulse which caused candidate Kennedy trouble, expressed in his suggestion, which Mr. Nixon found so shocking, that it might be proper and wise to express regrets for the U-2 flight.

All that remains is application. The President sees the targets; he needs the means of delivery. And if he is to deliver, he will have to explain, not once but constantly. For it is now his task to create and continually renew that consent which comes from popular understanding of what needs to be done and why. The educational function of the Presidency, long neglected, becomes of highest importance. The businessman's era has ended; the estrangement of informed intelligence from governing has ended; non-politics in the White House has ended; the tired have retired and the men of energy and boundless self-confidence are in charge.

Jurisdictional Lines

No fallacy is more enticing to the unwary government official or can be more mischievous than that of thinking of the world as being marked off by the nice distinctions corresponding to the pigeonholes of bureaucracy. This fallacy operates in many ways – as, for example, when some particular undertaking, being labeled military in disregard of its accompanying economic, cultural, political and other implications, is shepherded by the Pentagon as its very and exclusive own, or when some project in foreign economic development is launched without account of limiting factors of cultural and political circumstance.

The annals of government are replete with instances. In Robert Frost's words –

> No one stands round to stare.
> It's nobody else's affair.
> It couldn't be called ungentle.
> But how thoroughly departmental.

Then some day the matter concerned will spill over far and wide, producing a crisis to shake and penetrate the bulkheads of bureaucracy. It is not necessary to look beyond unhappy, war-divided Laos to illustrate how reality cuts across bureaucratic rigidities.

Still, there must be a State Department, a Defense Department, and agencies for agriculture, finance, foreign aid, and all the rest – though each of them is involved in some way in what happens in Laos – or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberia. To rub out bureaucratic categories of policy is impracticable; it would reduce policy-making to chaos. To bow to them as determinative and truly reflective of external realities results in contradiction between one line of policy and another. The solution lies essentially in placing in authority minds equipped to think across jurisdictional divisions and to grasp the relatedness between one aspect and another of national policy. And that is what Mr. Kennedy has been doing.

Dean Rusk, for example, was an accomplished officer of the Army before distinguishing himself in the State Department to which he is to return as Secretary. His part in fusing political and military policy in the Korean action was a central one. His work with the Rockefeller Brothers' panel on defense policy reflects his continuing vital awareness of the interplay of military security, economic growth and domestic politics. It is scarcely imaginable that he would ever follow the example of the late John Foster Dulles in regarding foreign policy and the factors of military power as if they operated in separate worlds.

Likewise, in Douglas Dillon the Treasury will have a Secretary knowledgeable in the ins and outs of foreign economic policy, strategic considerations, and the potentials and limits of diplomacy as well as a man eminent in finance. It is inconceivable that he would try to operate in the one-dimensional world of his predecessor of eight years ago, George Humphrey.

To run the Atomic Energy Commission and the Army, Mr. Kennedy picks two brilliant heads of universities. As a roving Ambassador he names Averell Harriman whose interests and experience cut across all conceivable lines. And Walt Rostow, a brilliantly speculative "generalist," will rove the White House as a consultant on foreign affairs.

To the Budget Bureau the new Director, David Bell, also will bring wide-ranging intelligence. One may turn to his unrehearsed testimony on developments in Pakistan given at the Capitol two years ago for an illustration of his facility in analysis discriminating among various aspects of policy. And finally, the new Director of the Disarmament Administration, John J. McCloy, embodies in unusual measure that thoroughly undepartmentalized grasp of foreign and defense policy demanded by his critical assignment.

On the Last Day

On January 19, the day after the report by Ronald Steel (page 11-12) went to press, the Federal Communications Commission finally cleared the way for AT&T to launch experimental space communications between the US and Europe. Under the new space "partnership" plan approved by the Eisenhower Administration on its last day, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency will launch the satellites and Bell will reimburse the government. Within two years Bell officials expect to complete a network of 50 space satellites, at an estimated cost of $190 million, which will permit the global transmission of telephone, television, radio, telegraph and business machine messages.

McNamara's Gesture

A hermit with a begging bowl, preferably empty, is the only businessman whose confirmation as a government executive does not raise questions of a conflict of economic interest between private advantage and public service. This past week's confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee of Robert McNamara as Secretary of Defense revived discussion of this thorny problem.

The record of malfeasance, demonstrating the reality of conflict of interest and official yielding to private temptation, is long: in 1960 a series of questionable cases at the Department of Agriculture (related to grain storage) and at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (related to the Food and Drug Administration), as well as repeated instances over recent years at the Department of Defense, document the opportunities for private profit to those willing to abuse a public trust. But the techniques for protecting the public interest while time enabling able executives to undertake government service are not simple.

Eight years ago, when Charlie (Engine) Wilson – then head of General Motors as Mr. McNamara has now been head of Ford – came up for confirmation as Defense chief, the Senate stood firm against it until Mr. Wilson had divested himself of his very considerable stock holdings in his company. As one commentator put it, the Senators finally took him, by a 77-to-6 vote, lock and barrel but without the stock. The case of Robert Stevens, named Secretary of the Army, was more complex; the J. P. Stevens Company was a family affair, from which his withdrawal was inconsistent with continuous management.

All executives from corporations of any size receive a considerable part of their compensation not in salary checks or even stock options but in fringe benefits, such as life and health insurance or pension rights. These are set up on a group principle; an individual can be extricated only if he loses all by withdrawal.

So unless he is a hermit with a bowl, the incoming executive is likely to be in jeopardy under the law, and the present statutes on conflict of interest, contained in 18 US Code 1914, are vague enough and harsh enough to diminish incentive to serve under them. Penalties against violators occur under criminal procedure. Dur-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing hearings last May, Sen. Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Government Operations Committee, noted their effect on the hiring of qualified persons. Harold Boeschenstein, president of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation, on the strength of experience in and out of government, named "the most serious obstacle" to recruitment "the vagueness of the laws and regulations dealing with conflicts of interest." And so, during the last session of Congress, several bills were introduced in an effort to combine realism and clarity. The Cellar bill offered substantial revisions of the present act while maintaining its general format including the use of criminal procedure.

The Lindsay bill embodied the recommendations resulting from the study of a special committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York: they would recast the act to provide enforcement under civil penalties, to distinguish between full- and part-time or temporary appointees, and to distinguish among full-time employees according to the sensitivity of the posts they fill. As to fringe benefits, the group enumerated a list whose continued enjoyment they proposed should be regarded as not in conflict with the public interest.

These bills will be reintroduced this session.

Meanwhile Mr. McNamara has taken the unparalleled step, in advance of presenting himself for confirmation, of selling all his securities held by himself or his wife and putting the proceeds into a trusteeship which will divorce him from knowledge of or participation in the management of the funds while he is in office. At the hearing he said he expects to instruct the trustee to present periodic reports of holdings to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and that he would be glad also to submit copies of his income tax return; he also mentioned an instruction to investment counsel to put no funds in companies whose securities are known as "defense stocks."

Several members suggested that his investments be confined to firms that have no dealings with government or the Defense Department; Mr. McNamara demurred on the grounds that such companies are few and far between – the Defense Department buys missiles but it also buys floor wax. Others proposed that his holdings be put exclusively into government bonds; he countered with the comment that if this were done, he could not fail to affect the value of his entire estate every time he participated in a Cabinet decision on the interest rate.

At the close of the series of hearings, the committee decided to confirm the entire new top command subject to notification that they had sold all stocks they own in companies holding defense contracts as listed in the General Counsel's office of the department. But in view of what Senator Russell called "this very harsh requirement," a subcommittee was appointed to consider possible revision of the conflict-of-interest laws, and President Kennedy commissioned three law professors, all expert on conflict-of-interest problems, to prepare a fresh study and recommend necessary changes.

NEXT WEEK

Is the choice before us world suicide or abandoning nuclear weapons? Robert W. Tucker, author of The Just War, *offers some reflections on the meaning of nuclear pacifism.*

Public Property

On September 22 last year in Billings, Montana, candidate John F. Kennedy said, "no more Hell's Canyon blunders!" and pledged that as President he would appoint "men who will put the public interest first." His selection of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior was the first redemption of that pledge, and the second was the appointment of Kenneth Holum as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Water and Power.

Mr. Holum is a revealing choice. He was director of the Western Water and Power Consumers Conference, which sponsored the Billings meeting. He has been director of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association, made up of municipal power groups, cooperatives, labor union and farm organization officials. "The new Administration," he said before his appointment, "might well ask the Federal Power Commission to hold up all pending private requests for water power sites, until it can be determined which of them can best be developed by the federal government." And, he added, "the power industry serves America best when the federal government, local public agencies, rural cooperatives and investor-owned companies all participate; but a certain ration of federal participation and leadership stimulates the whole industry to serve better."

It therefore looks as if we are about to make a sharp left turn from the Eisenhower doctrine of priority for private interests, back toward the earlier public-oriented position of the two Roosevelts, George Norris and Gifford Pinchot. And about time. Over these past eight years, there have been many efforts – some successful – to loot the country's natural wealth. The 772 million acres of federal lands, which include vast recreation, wildlife, watershed, timber, grazing and other resource values and which return over a quarter of a billion dollars in annual revenues to the Treasury, have been subject to neglect and misappropriation. Thus,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Eisenhower Administration had barely settled into office when the would-be looters rose to the surface. Sen. Frank Barrett of Wyoming introduced a bill which would have granted to private livestock operators permanent rights, tantamount to ownership, to the summer grazing lands in the national forests. Senator Gordon and Congressman Ellsworth of Oregon proposed that the government turn over to private parties portions of the national forests to compensate them for private lands acquired by the government under its right of eminent domain. Then, early in 1954, the Al Sarena mining claim scandal came to light. In this case, the Secretary of Interior set aside his own rules and regulations in order to issue patents to 475 acres of timberland in the Rogue River National Forest of southern Oregon – under the guise of mining claims. It is estimated that some $600,000 worth of land and prime timber was acquired by Al Sarena Mines, Inc. for a total payment to the government of $2,375.

The McKay administration of Interior also was tarnished with the "give-away" of the magnificent Hell's Canyon water power site on the Snake River to a company which skimmed off for its private benefit some of the site's major economic values; oil exploitation rights were granted favored interests in wildlife refuges which theretofore had been protected.

In January, 1960, a House Government Operations Subcommittee began to inquire into land exchanges approved by the Interior's Bureau of Land Management and concluded that public lands in Arizona had been exchanged for private lands at a small fraction of their real value. Shortly after the exchanges were consummated, the private parties sold the government lands for hundreds of thousands of dollars more than was paid for them, and in one instance the true values were millions of dollars more.

Much now needs to be done. For example, the mining laws should be revised to make impossible timber grabs of the Al Sarena variety. The more than 5,000 public land laws should be rewritten and codified to facilitate conservation management of the unappropriated public domain. Provision should be made in public land laws for disposal of lands to cities and counties where such lands are needed for urban development. But the owners of these lands – the citizens of the entire country – should receive their full market value. Above all, the Bureau of Land Management and its parent Department of the Interior need a thorough house-cleaning, which under Secretary Udall they will no doubt receive.

One may anticipate that the new Administration will take more than a negative interest in all-public development of remaining key sites on the Columbia River and elsewhere, in the interest, as Mr. Kennedy's task force on natural resources said last week, "not only [of] flood control and reclamation benefits, but power, navigation and recreational dividends. . . ." The new Administration is also likely to favor a "giant-power" federal transmission grid between river basins – the Columbia, Colorado, Missouri, and the Central Valley – to transfer electric power back and forth as needed, thus carrying out Pinchot's dream of 30 years ago.

"There's the Monster That Controls This Property"

In speeches he made in the West during the campaign, which went relatively unnoticed nationally, Mr. Kennedy in effect embraced the concept of federal planning of the whole national resource and conservation program embodied in a bill introduced last year by Sen. James E. Murray of Montana and 29 other Senators, and which was reaffirmed in the task force report. It is proposed that a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers to the President be established, parallel to the Council of Economic Advisers. A joint Congressional committee on natural resources, similar to the joint committee on atomic energy, would also be set up, and these two new bodies would put together "a permanent inventory" of all our natural resources and lay out a long-term "rational schedule of action" in a field now marked by growing chaos and multitudinous clashing interests. (A study of just one small river basin, for example, reveals no less than 50 agencies, federal, state, local and private, each with a clamorous claim on vanishing water.)

"Our goal," candidate Kennedy said, "must be the fullest utilization of every drop and gallon in American streams." That means, among other things, the cleaning up of polluted streams. It may mean too, picking one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole river basin, such as the already thirsty Colorado, for a giant outdoor laboratory, as has been suggested by experts retained by the Kerr Committee of the Senate, in which full experimentation could be conducted in controlling evaporation, bringing down more precipitation by cloud seeding, or developing deeper winter snow packs.

Another great project favored by the task force in its report to Mr. Kennedy is the economic conversion of salty and brackish waters into fresh waters. Finding a cheap and large-scale freshening process and making it available to the world, would, as the new President said in the campaign, "do more to build friendship and prestige in the underdeveloped countries, many of them bordering on the oceans, than all the Sputniks and Explorers put together."

In addition, some action can be expected on Mr. Kennedy's pledge to create a "capital investment" budget for such federal projects as repay their own cost in whole or in part, or show a profit. This is a departure in federal bookkeeping long advocated by Senators Douglas and Morse. Specifically, federal power plants like those of the TVA, the Columbia basin and Hoover Dam, are money-earning enterprises. They repay their own cost with interest, and in the Western reclamation program especially, help to pay irrigation and other costs. But none of this shows on the government's books, so that their opponents can and do charge that they are nothing but a vast expense to the federal taxpayer. A separate investment budget would show their earnings along with costs, together with the earnings of other federal enterprises.

FOR ALL OUR AID, VIETNAM IS A CASTLE BUILT ON SAND

Diem's One-Family War

The flashes of lightning in the Laotian sky ought not to distract our attention from the thunder clouds gathering in South Vietnam, where American policies are certain to be heavily tested in the lifetime of the new Administration.

The 3,000 to 5,000 armed guerrillas who remained in the South after the Geneva Agreement ended the Indo-China war in 1954 have been reinforced recently by cadres and activists from North Vietnam. Working according to the strict Maoist formula they have directed their principal efforts toward the stimulation of peasant unrest – in particular against the "agro-villes," or new rural towns which are being created by the concentration of scattered peasant families, and against repressive security laws, which have been made necessary by the activities of the Communists.

This disquieting rural unease is, in turn, reflected through most of the country. President Ngo Dinh Diem's position has been challenged once already by military force and may well be challenged again. There is continuing frustration among many genuinely anti-Communist nationalists whose assistance has never been sought by Diem. Unemployment is high. And, to a large extent, South Vietnam, like South Korea, has fallen into the status of permanent mendicant, with most of the imports required to keep inflation down being paid for by the United States.

United States aid has succeeded over more than six years in keeping South Vietnam out of Communist hands. In itself, this is a major accomplishment, and one that did not seem even remotely possible in 1954 when Diem came to office in the hour of French military defeat and found himself called upon not only to fight the rebellious Army rump left over by Bao Dai, but Binh Xuyen gangsters, who controlled both the police and the vice of Saigon, the exotic religious sects, the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hoa, as well as the British and French, who were equally determined to get rid of him. Sir Hubert Graves, the then British Ambassador, was all for a more docile leader who would have accepted the provisions of the Geneva Agreement (which South Vietnam did not sign) and would certainly have extended Ho Chi Minh's leadership over the entire country; Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, Britain's Commissioner-General in Southeast Asia, referred to Diem quite publicly as "the worst Prime Minister I have ever known"; and the French participated directly, and indirectly, in military activities against the Diem Government.

Diem's dogged resistance overcame the Binh Xuyen and the sects and eventually won British and French support. American aid helped to resettle three-quarters of a million Northerners who fled from the Communists, knocked the hodge-podge of military forces left over from the Indo-China war into a conventional fighting force of 150,000 men, brought inflation under control, built a number of strategic roads, improved

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

health services, and rehabilitated the rice industry and some of the fledgling secondary industries that had fallen victim to the war.

All of this was creditable, and, as a temporary expedient, perhaps satisfactory enough. It has not been sufficient, however, to save South Vietnam from the prospect of a Communist take-over. The question now is, therefore, what should the United States do in South Vietnam? First of all, to match the 350,000-man Viet Cong Army, the United States built up an Army which is larger than any under-developed economy in a country of only 13 million can possibly bear. It is a good Army, but it is a conventional Army created in the image of its American instructors. Against a direct, conventional attack from the North it could be counted on to do well, even though outnumbered two to one; however, no such attack is likely. During the Indo-China war the Viet Cong regulars (then Viet Minh) fought only against targets of opportunity when they had all tactical advantages on their side and the main French supporting forces were tied down by guerrillas and regional forces. Those are the only terms under which the Viet Cong are likely to fight; and against such attack the South Vietnamese Army, plagued by swarms of guerrillas, is not likely to prove more effective than its predecessor, the French Union Army of 1954. Nor would it be more effective if it were three times its present size.

Trite as it may sound to say so, the Communists must be countered where they are – at the grass roots. And assuming that the American aid commitment is to remain constant at, say, $250 million a year (most of which at present goes in direct military support), a first saving must be to reduce the size of the Army, perhaps by as much as 100,000 men, diverting the released funds first to the "agrovilles," their defense and improvement, and second to economic development.

As the British and Malayans discovered in the Communist insurrection in Malaya, the resettlement of isolated peasants into villages and their separation from the guerrillas is a priority task. It is one that can succeed, however, only with the cooperation of the peasants. They must be convinced that their living conditions, economically, and in terms of security, will be improved; and they must be encouraged (by all means, including secret payment for information) to be primarily responsible for their own village defense.

A second, longer-range but nonetheless urgent, requirement is economic development. American help in rice production has been highly effective. But rice, like wheat, is hard to sell these days. Industrial development, apart from the rehabilitation of a sugar refinery, a jute mill and a rubber factory, has been negligible.

The US official belief that free enterprise and foreign private investment ought to take care of industrial growth is nonsense in countries like this. An Australian who exports duck feathers is the only significant foreign industrial entrepreneur to have appeared on the scene in recent years: in his specialized line he has done fabulously well; but it is wishful thinking to believe that others will follow.

Yet the need for such development is demonstrable simply in economic terms quite apart from the political fact of the common desire among South Vietnamese, as among the people of all under-developed countries, to push on quickly with industrialization. Many consumer goods now imported could be manufactured in South Vietnam with little capital and minimal technical skills. Unfortunately, free foreign enterprise is unlikely to provide either the capital or the skills. Nor is it realistic to expect that they will be forthcoming in such an unstable political climate as this.

The need, as one sophisticated South Vietnamese once said, is not for more dollars but for more sense, an appreciation that the best hope for South Vietnam is to make it self-sufficient, capable of defending itself and dependent on a self-generating economy. The problem is not of exclusive interest and importance to the United States. Yet for the most part America's allies are content to supply only the criticism – while the United States provides the finance. My own country, Australia, is one of the most concerned – and one of the most vulnerable. It contributes less than $11 million a year in aid to under-developed countries in the South and Southeast Asian area – and its standard of living is nearly as high (and in some respects higher) than that of the United States.

The Kennedy Administration could – and should – insist on greater contributions from its allies in meaningful aid projects. The requirement in South Vietnam speaks for itself. It needs technical schools. It needs schools for administration. It needs project aid. And it also needs political advice.

President Ngo Dinh Diem has many admirable qualities. He is immensely hard-working. He is a dedicated patriot. But he is fighting a one-man, or a one-family, war against Communism; and that is not good enough. Stringent measures are necessary to combat the Communist guerrillas, but all who are critical of Diem in South Vietnam are not Communists. Diem's tendency to equate opposition with treason has alienated thousands of Vietnamese no less concerned than he is with keeping South Vietnam out of Communist hands. The Dai Viet Party (who, on their record of six years ago, could scarcely be accused of being pro-Communist has disappeared because Diem did not want its help). Democratic institutions, such as free elections, have been turned into a farce. Imprisonment is the punishment for criticism. South Vietnam is menaced less by the threat of aggression from without than by collapse and subversion from within. It is a classic case of a castle built on sand.

Denis Warner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Return Flight

The Visitation of the Eggheads – the 155 distinguished, but non-political and non-military characters invited by President and Mrs. Kennedy to sit on the platform during the inauguration – was a phenomenon of great interest and possibly of great significance.

If it means no more than that Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy are polite to artistic genius, it is pleasant, but hardly portentous. It is possible, however, that the incident indicates that the incoming President has a clearer understanding of quality advertising than all Madison Avenue; and in that case it carries connotations of vast significance.

Everybody has noticed the prevalence of Phi Beta Kappas in the new Administration, and a week before the inauguration R. G. Tugwell was expressing privately the opinion that the flight from intellectuality is ended. But that is inexact. There has been no flight from certain forms of intellectuality, only from philosophy. Washington has been compelled to respect men who understand what $e=mc^2$ means, but not those who understand what *ars longa, vita brevis* implies; so as our missiles have improved, our prestige has declined; as Polaris rises, so does Castro.

Our technicians have produced the weapons, but it is our prestige that has given us the bases by which we have been able to clamp an iron ring around the Communist power; and it is the decline of prestige that has enabled Communism to burst the ring at Cuba and perhaps in Southeast Asia. The fatal defect of the Madison Avenue style of thinking is to assume that prestige rests upon two chickens in every pot and two TV sets in every living room, although in fact it has quite different origins.

The presence of the 155 on the platform behind him as he took the oath certainly suggests a proclamation by President Kennedy of faith in the explosive power of ideas, as well as bombs. The steel-tipped tanks that passed in review before him are necessary, are indispensable; but at that it is extremely doubtful that the hydrogen bomb will ever destroy half as many governments as have been blown up by the words, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

People who can produce such ideas are therefore an integral part, and in the long run the more effective part of our national defenses, though some may disagree, and I admit that my interpretation is purely speculative. What ranks as a better-informed guess, because it is supported by precedent, is the impending change in the atmosphere of Washington. Twice within the memory of living men the White House has been transformed into a haunt of such weird, un-American characters as philosophers, poets, painters, musicians and novelists; and twice the appearance of these odd fish has presaged an era of great excitement.

The two occasions were the successive reigns of the two Roosevelts. Theodore is remembered as the most rambunctious President since Andrew Jackson; but we tend to forget that his taste for cowboys and ju-jitsu experts was paralleled by an equal enthusiasm for anybody who could write a book, or stage a play, or construct a theory that embodied something that had not been said before. Yet O. Henry, the short-story writer, noted at the time that every American artist stood in fear of "the Great Displeasure in the White House." They also hoped for commendation thence.

Everybody remembers, though, that in the first Administration of the second Roosevelt – that is to say, before the soldier became the most important man in the world – the White House premises were infested with poets and dancers almost as heavily as with Senators and Major Generals. And in those days the atmosphere of Washington crackled with ideas. If a large proportion of them were goofy they were nevertheless exciting, and thinkers could live faster in Washington than anywhere else in the country.

If the Visitation of the Eggheads means that the Kennedy Administration will afford a repetition of that experience, American politics will be galvanized. The country will not necessarily be edified, but it will certainly be interested; and as far back as Jefferson it was known that when the people lose interest in the conduct of public affairs corruption begins to creep into government. So it may be plausibly argued that the excitement created by ideas, even bad ones, is salutary in that it discourages the infiltration of crooks into high places.

Be that as it may, a superficial observer is not dismayed by the prospect that the national capital may be relieved of the dullness that has settled upon it like Los Angeles smog in recent years. We shall probably get more, but if we got out of it only "a raree-show worth the penny" that would be better than nothing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fingers in the Space Pie

In a farewell effort designed to bind the hands of his successor, Dwight Eisenhower gave his approval to a policy favoring private development of communications satellites. "The government," he said, "should aggressively encourage private enterprise in the establishment and operation of satellite relays for revenue-producing purposes." No longer relegated to the fantasies of science fiction, communications satellites will, within the next half dozen years, form the backbone of an international communications system relaying telephone, television, radio and telegraph messages around the world. By staking out an early claim, private industry hopes to gain exclusive control over this fast-expanding and potentially lucrative enterprise.

The departed Administration's sympathy for private control over this vital field has been no secret. T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), had proposed that the government should help pay for private industry's venture into space communications by launching at cost satellites developed by private companies. Since they could hardly launch their satellites without rockets – researched, developed, paid for and still controlled by the government – Glennan's largesse would be a powerful boost to the ambitions of private industry. At the going rate, it costs some $4 million to buy and launch a single missile capable of putting a satellite into orbit. Although Bell is willing to take the government up on its offer, would it (or other private firms) be willing to foot the bill – which could mount to tens of millions of dollars – if several missile launching attempts were required? If not, would the government then step in with launching subsidies?

Such a subsidy would be peanuts compared to the multi-billion dollar publicly-financed research projects which led to the development of space satellites. Ignoring, however, the taxpayers' contributions which resulted in developing both satellites and rockets, Mr. Glennan believes that NASA should continue its efforts in research and development "only so long as necessary to assure that timely development of a commercially feasible communications system will be completed by private industry."

As early as last summer AT&T was recommending that government set aside radio frequencies for a proposed network of Bell space satellites. Although there has been a certain amount of foot-dragging by government agencies – not yet ready to cope with the broad range of policy questions posed by the advent of the space age – AT&T has gone ahead making plans with its customary vigor. Scientists at Bell Telephone Laboratories have been at work on a 175-pound Bell satellite of the active repeater type, similar to the Courier satellite launched by the Army last October. The Bell satellite, first of a series of satellites in a proposed space network, would carry electronic equipment capable of receiving and retransmitting radio signals from earth. It would serve as a relay station in space for the experimental transmission of telephone calls and television broadcasts between the US and Europe, and as the first privately-owned satellite, its appearance would mark a giant step forward toward the coming commercial utilization of space.

Bell's experimental satellite is expected to be ready for launching before the end of the year. Within two years Bell officials expect to complete a network of space satellites which will permit the global transmission of telephone, television, radio, telegraph and business machine messages. The cost of the project is estimated at about $82 million. The coming of space satellites will open up a virtually unlimited number of new channels for intercontinental communications. Underwater cables, already jammed with 3 million telephone calls a year between the US and Europe, could not adequately handle an expected 100 million annual calls by 1980. An underwater cable can presently hold 80 telephone channels, but no television. The commercial satellites are expected to handle 600 telephone channels or a two-way television broadcast. Increasing the number of satellites will expand facilities up to demand – and at a cost far less than that of underwater cables.

For several months AT&T has been carrying on private negotiations with the government-owned telephone systems of France, Britain and West Germany. These countries have shown interest in cooperating with Bell in the early establishment of the satellite communications system linking the US with Europe. The Bell negotiations with the government agencies of the three nations have been conducted under the watchful, but still powerless, gaze of several federal agencies. While aware of some of the important questions raised by Bell's plans to set up a global communications network, US officials have so far neither worked out a policy nor have been granted the authority to regulate this vital area of public interest. In the midst of disinterest, timidity and wait-and-see indecisiveness in Washington, Bell and other private companies have pushed full speed ahead into space. Recently General Electric, determined not to be left fizzling on the launching pad, announced that it was planning future ventures into space. Other firms such as RCA, Philco and Hughes Aircraft have been working on government

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

satellite projects and presumably could go into private space communications on a "revenue-producing" basis any time they found it economically interesting to do so.

Drift and Vacillation

Official Washington's unwillingness to cope with the wide range of policy issues raised by commercial utilization of space was recently attacked by the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (headed by Lyndon Johnson until his recent appointment as chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and now by Robert Kerr). In its report last month, the committee pointed out what has long been glaringly apparent – that the government has no overall policy for developing communications satellites and that no agency is even in charge of drafting such a policy. The Committee charged that space communications could be seriously hampered unless some critical decisions are promptly made on a host of technical, diplomatic and political questions.

The space committee leveled a sharp attack against the Federal Communications Commission by way of illustrating the government's lack of coordination in space policy. Last July Leo Heogh, director of the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization (in charge of coordinating government use of radio frequencies) urged the FCC to exercise care in allocating microwave frequencies until space communication needs could be determined. The frequencies, which the FCC is empowered to assign, are also in heavy demand from local short-range users. Later the same month officials from AT&T appeared before the FCC and urged the commissioners to set aside a broad range of radio frequencies for space satellites. In October – two months after the successful launching of the Echo balloon satellite and just a week before the launching of the Courier repeater satellite – the FCC ignored all space requests and opened up a broad range of microwave frequencies to private short-range users. The major gainers: trucking companies which can now obtain radio licenses. The majority of commissioners held that space communications were in such an uncertain stage of development that it would be premature to set aside radio frequencies for their use. NASA officials were disturbed by the FCC's action, but powerless to do anything about it. The lone FCC dissenter, Commissioner T. A. M. Craven, accused the FCC of a "lack of long-range vision." He warned that as a result of the decision space communications would be buried under a myriad of radio users such as banks, department stores and grocery chains.

The continuing assault upon the FCC has been reinforced by James M. Landis in his report to President Kennedy on the regulatory agencies. Mr. Landis charged that the FCC had "drifted, vacillated and stalled," and "seems incapable of policy planning." AT&T has plopped the issue right back on the FCC's desk by applying for microwave frequencies for the experimental satellite which it plans to launch later on this year.

Within the next several months (hopefully before AT&T launches its first experimental satellite in the fall) Washington policymakers will have to decide what radio frequencies should be set aside for communication satellites and who should be awarded the valuable bands. They must set up international agreements over these frequencies and determine how a privately-operated space communications system, if that is what we are to have, can be integrated into an international network. They must decide whether AT&T, which has so far been first with the most, should be allowed to gain a favored position in a space communications network – or whether any single company should be allowed to gain *de facto* predominance. They must mediate between rival space programs within the government itself and give clearer guidelines to agencies now engaged in satellite research. Under an arbitrary division originally designed to minimize friction, the civilian space agency was given the right to develop "passive" balloon satellites such as Echo, while the military was given a free hand over the more sophisticated "active" repeater satellites such as Courier. Now that active satellites seem to be more promising for space communications, the division has broken down. NASA is pressing to build its own repeater satellites with electronic innards, and the Air Force is hard at work intruding into the space domain of both the Army and the NASA by developing its own passive satellites.

Finally, at the heart of all the pressing problems raised by the growing family of communications satellites, is the issue of whether private industry should be allowed control over the coming era of space communications. The Eisenhower Administration has boosted private industry's claims to exclusive control by accepting Bell's argument that our present system of privately-owned commercial communications should be extended into the space field. But the answer to the question of private *vs* public control of communications satellites is not so simple as it may appear to industry's advocates. Taxpayers have so far invested some $25 billion in the US military and civilian space program. NASA's budget, which was $500 million in 1958, jumped to $915 million last year and is scheduled to hit $1.1 billion this year. The question that no one seems ready to answer and few are even willing to pose is: should private industry be allowed the windfall gain of cashing in on the public's multi-billion dollar research program just when its commercial applications have become clear, or should the public be allowed to recoup some of its investment by keeping a measure of control over space communications?

RONALD STEEL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MIDDLE EAST

Things have somehow gone wrong ever since Dulles started patting Arabs on the shoulder with one hand and holding an anti-Communist geiger counter in the other.

Broadly speaking, in this first year of the Kennedy era the Middle East is divided between countries that have experienced some mid-century revolution, and countries that live subject to *ancien regimes* such as sheikdoms or monarchies. Among the first are Turkey, the UAR, Israel, Lebanon and Iraq, all of which have had violent upheavals within recent memory. These peoples, or the educated men and women among them, have a sense of participation in their destiny; they think of themselves as sharing in the actions of leaders who have the same sort of backgrounds and ambitions as themselves. Ranged in the second group are Jordan, Saudi Arabia and – most significant of the three – Iran. All these are lands of the disgruntled, the envious and the frustrated. No matter how hard their rulers try to better the national lot (and King Hussein of Jordan and the Shah of Iran are both doing so, each according to his lights), their citizens think themselves cheated of their due. They view their governments as "they" and not "we." No one (save Dr. Mossadegh for a brief interlude in Iran) has wakened in them a sense of involvement in a nation. Discontent is rife.

Examine the two lists again. Any American policy-maker can begin by excluding the Turks and the Israelis from his reckoning, for both, though geographically in the Middle East, belong to the West. Both share our interests, use our vocabulary to mean what we mean, and have good reason to continue to keep our company. There remain the Arabs and the Iranians, and as soon as they are scanned afresh, an anomaly arises. The more stable and the more contented group consists of peoples lukewarm or intermittently hostile toward us; to it belong the Nassers and the Qassems who are as ready to do business with Moscow as with Washington. It is not here, but in the dissatisfied, unstable group that we find those whom we are wont to reckon as friends and allies – the three kings of Orient toward whom we have, in one way and another, accepted obligations, paying a subsidy to Hussein, passing oil revenues to Saud, and righting the unbalance in the budgets of Mohammed Reza Shah. Willy nilly, therefore, we find ourselves forced to devise two approaches to the Middle East, one for the confirmed neutralists, and one for friendly but unpopular rulers whose seat on their thrones depends at least in part on our support.

A difficulty which dogs the US everywhere, as it once dogged the British, is that both groups are on edge for a reason that is not of our making. A century ago, all Arabs, Egyptians and Persians belonged to a stable society, steeped in social tradition and spiritually upheld by the certainties of a great religion. Their way of life stemmed, unbroken, from centuries in which they had led the known world in education, science and culture. The Arabs still belonged to and were proud of the wide Ottoman Empire. Suddenly, into the quiet pool there splashed Western man, equipped, to their astonishment and mortification, with tools that spelled power and wealth palpably greater than their own. At first, they aspired to copy him; they discarded the old conventions that had held them together, and, agog, went to Europe and America in search of the keys to the kingdom. But from 1918, when Western man landed on their shores in the shape of British and French mandatory powers, they began to perceive his war-torn, booty-hunting face, and a revulsion set in. American support for Zionism, and Anglo-American attempts to make friendship contingent upon support for the Cold War with Russia, have increased it. Today, most Arabs and Persians are ready to admit that Western help has advanced their interests technically, educationally and economically, but all judge it to have failed them on counts which they think equally important. For instance, they rate Western democratic patterns to have been a failure, and to have led to nothing but devices for perpetuating the privileges of their upper classes. They rate Western social remedies as ineffectual, as barely denting their problems of inequality, and as productive of inflation. They rate all Westerners as materialists who have, spiritually, nothing to offer a Moslem. "Why do we need alien models?" ask both modern Arabs and modern Persians. "Surely we children of great civilizations can evolve, on the basis of our own Islamic values, some social structure that will recover us our place in the sun."

But they have as yet found no touchstone for that evolution. Indeed, their disquiet of mind is enhanced by physical problems that crowd in upon them, such as overpopulation in Egypt, or disparity between the wealth of the oil states and the poverty of their neighbors, or the way in which their deeply-felt desire for Arab unity breaks down under the stresses of parochialism as soon as they try to put it into practice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Baffled, some of them have turned to religious leaders for guidance, only to be put off by the medieval remedies suggested; others have tried the intellectual and professional classes, but found them disappointing; now the recourse is to soldiers. Yet the answer still eludes them. They are living, therefore, under profound social and emotional strain, and all men so afflicted are touchy and difficult of approach.

Yet overtures are imperative. They need our technical attainments and our investment potential; we need their oil exports to Europe, and their stable continuance as independent nations. It would be as contrary to our interests as to theirs were some totalitarian empire, whether Soviet or Chinese, to engulf them against their will. Can the new men in Washington evolve some novel and better line of approach that will convince them of these home truths?

How Important Are Armies?

Contrary to our one-time belief, the operation we need to undertake is no longer a military one. The days when the British infuriated the Middle East by angling for bases are over. In terms of global warfare, the armies of the Middle East are useless, and we have no interest in arming them except on a basis of straight commercial competition – perhaps on easy terms – with other armament-manufacturing states. Happily, physical aggression against any one of them would do the attacker more harm than good with all the rest, and is therefore unlikely. The contest ahead is primarily between ideas, attitudes, manners. The US starts at a disadvantage *vis-à-vis* Moscow, which, in contrast to London and Washington, has been content to proffer services without asking for any *quid pro quo;* Moscow, also in contrast to Washington, is admired as a nation that has levered itself from serfdom to social strength in a generation. At the same time, it is thought as foreign as the US, and the Middle East does not want to copy Soviet patterns either.

The door is ajar, therefore, if only we go the right way about pushing it wider. We generate resentment if we patronize, or suggest that the way of life in our very different world is the one to strive for, or even if we dispense much-needed soup and bandages at the hands of young amateurs on vacation from college. To register prowess, we need to concentrate on the services that only we can render, and that Arabs and Iranians can therefore accept with dignity. We must stick to expertise – that is, to our high technical skills and our investment, both public and private, if possible launched in conjunction with public and private investment of local origin. (A promising model is the agreement announced this month for underwriting, a new steel industry in Turkey, financed jointly by the Development Loan Fund, American firms and Turkish investors from both the public and the private sector.)

Elsewhere, the Aswan Dam (which is being financed mainly by the Soviet Union) is not the only project in the offing. Other and smaller ones abound, and the people whose respect we want to earn by our demeanor are the people interested in them – the young technicians, the would-be modern farmers, and the small industrial entrepreneurs, men just as important as the established government servants and the moneyed captains of industry. For it is from this new class of technicians, and embryo technicians, that may emerge the custodians of the progress for which the Middle East is yearning, and which the mullahs, kings and politicians, professors and colonels have so far failed to produce.

All these precepts are much easier to practice in the post-revolutionary countries, partly because of their greater degree of assurance and self-confidence, but also because in countries unaccustomed to the habit of private investment, and where a high degree of state capitalism is inevitable, it is more satisfactory to proffer help that is bound to strengthen the government if that government is at one with its people. Our role is more delicate when we appear to fortify a ruler who is a local target of criticism and hostility, as is King Hussein among all his subjects but the Bedouin, and King Saud among townsmen who want him to surrender some of his autocratic powers, and the Shah among those who deplore his weakness in curbing the malpractices of his court. Yet, these three men are old friends of ours, and cannot be let down. Moreover, they are rulers, and a foreign government has no choice but to deal with them as such. Instant criticism would be our lot were we to single out and favor protégés among their critics.

As we move forward, we must neglect none of the experiences of the recent past. In particular, we must accept as fact that the peoples of the area are confirmedly neutralist, and that the best we can hope for is to keep them so. A past sample of wrong technique is the fussy dispatch of special presidential or diplomatic envoys to the spot directly some point is scored by Russia or by Communism (George Allen to Cairo after the Soviet arms deal in 1955, Loy Henderson to Syria's neighbors after a Communist was made head of the Syrian army, or rewarding an outgoing chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee – Mr. James Richards – by sending him on a fact-finding trip in 1957 to canvass for the Eisenhower Doctrine, during which, from inexperience, he misread us the omens).

More even than black Africa (where there are no great pasts, and revealed religions), the Middle East calls for handling by professionals. We can succeed only through the agency of men sensitive to local sensitivities, men alive to virtues that count for little in Chattanooga but much in Cairo, and technicians bound to command respect through their skills.

ELIZABETH MONROE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thinking About Disarmament

Mr. Keith Kyle, in a recent contribution to this journal, suggested that the US was not conveying effectively to the world our "real conviction" that we would welcome "a rapid transition to a state of total world disarmament." I would like to suggest, not in reply, but only as a cautionary observation, that the new Administration will lose little if it goes slow, or rather, goes sure – as its disarmament task force recommends – before undertaking the long, gruelling experience of disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union. By hastening to the conference table, a new team will be no better prepared than those of the past and will be no more likely to achieve any useful results.

The National Planning Association, whose arms control expert, Jerome Spingarn, was secretary for the Kennedy task force on the same subject, reported last July on the government's failure to prepare properly for negotiations. In the period, 1948 to 1952 there were seldom more than four professionals in the State Department assigned to disarmament. Presidential and Secretarial speech writers became architects of policy.

In 1955, President Eisenhower went to Geneva "with no certain intention" of introducing the dramatic "open skies" proposal. (According to Robert J. Donovan, in his book *Eisenhower: The Inside Story*, prepared with the help of the White House, "the decision was made at the last minute.") In 1957, at the London conference of the United Nations disarmament subcommittee, the prolonged negotiations were based on Governor Stassen's personal understanding of the American position. Stassen presented his widely-publicized "package proposal," on August 29, after consultations in Washington. But he omitted several items which had been privately discussed with the Soviet delegation several months earlier. The result was violent rejection.

In 1958, the US proposed a conference of technicians to discuss nuclear test detection and surprise attack. The Soviet Union did not agree until five months later, but when it did the United States had no prepared position, had conducted no technical research, had selected no technicians to meet with the Russians.

In 1959, the US introduced new seismic data at the Geneva meeting of nuclear test cessation experts. We asked that a scientific subgroup be appointed to discuss the new material, in view of its importance to the reliability of detection techniques. The Soviets stalled for 11 months. When they finally went along, Dr. James B. Fisk, President of Bell Laboratories, who had headed the 1958 team, was called in again, along with a newly-recruited team. Dr. Fisk afterward reported that the Russians' competence "pushed us into more work in Geneva than had been done at home in the previous many months."

In 1959, also, after the surprise attack conference had collapsed, Charles Coolidge was asked to head a long-range disarmament study to be completed by the following April. But when a major 10-nation disarmament conference was arranged, Mr. Coolidge was called off the long-range study and asked to prepare positions for the meeting with a new deadline of December 31. For various reasons, Mr. Coolidge's report was not accepted. But in line with the precedent of flimsy improvisation, a new man, Frederick Eaton, was appointed on December 3, 1959, to act as chief of the United States delegation to the 10-nation conference. Mr. Eaton had never before dealt with arms control and had never previously worked in any of the government departments concerned. Again there was a rush to carry out a new round of staff work. The Western allies were invited to come to Washington early in February to hear the American views, in advance of the conference that was to begin in Geneva in mid-March. But when the Allied representatives arrived, they were irritated to find that the US had not completed its position papers.

Time for Decisions

The summary of the Kennedy task force report quite properly recognized that "international pressures for an expression of views on disarmament would be heavy" and then urged the President-elect to "resist, insofar as possible, these demands for an early statement on the subject." Not because the task force minimized the importance and urgency of disarmament negotiations, but because "real accomplishments could be expected only if basic policy decisions were made and that since the United States had never developed such basic policies in the past, the policy-planning process could well be an extended one."

This would seem to indicate that the next few months, even longer, should be devoted to organization and planning, and it is satisfactory to note that Dean Rusk, the incoming Secretary of State, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week that it will be necessary to "draw additional talent" to the existing government disarmament groups. About 100 people now deal with disarmament in the Administration. Most of them will be retained in this work for a while. When Harold Stassen was special assistant to the President for disarmament in 1955-57, he had a staff of 30 or 35, about half of them on full time. When that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office was abolished, the number of full-time disarmament specialists at the State Department dwindled to about eight in 1958. They were headed by Philip J. Farley, Special Assistant for Atomic Energy and Disarmament. Experts at the Atomic Energy Commission, Pentagon, Central Intelligence Agency and others were consulted from time to time.

The staff expanded when President Eisenhower, under the pressure of Soviet overtures and world clamor, directed Secretary Herter to examine the need for enlarging and developing a disarmament staff. (There is reason to believe that the President was moved to act after a disarmament expert took the unusual course of posting a letter to him in a mailbox outside the White House.) This led to the formation of the Disarmament Administration under Edward Gullion, a career officer.

Meanwhile, the Pentagon, which for years has acted as a sort of unwelcome and unwilling participant in disarmament policy discussions, began to build a staff only last February. Lieutenant General John A. Dabney was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for Disarmament and Military Affairs, under the Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs; L. Addison Lanier, a Cincinnati lawyer, was named to head a staff of six professional experts. Some contracts were let for disarmament studies by private institutions. The Defense Department itself conducted secret studies of instrumentation needed to detect underground nuclear blasts. In the AEC, four men follow the problems of disarmament and test cessation. The President's Scientific Advisory Council also handles disarmament questions. And valuable contributions have been made by the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee.

However, it has been a haphazard and jerry-built arrangement, and the Kennedy Administration could use a bigger, better integrated organization. The suggestion by the new President's task force that the government's disarmament unit be made a statutory organization, subject to State Department policy but not limited to State Department personnel, has merit. The most important thing, however, is not the title or bureaucratic status of the organization. The official status of the United States Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration did not protect those organizations in their dog days. The existing set-up is satisfactory as a start, if only more money and able men are devoted to it.

> "The primary need in the arms control field is constructive and well-planned action. For 15 years our disarmament effort has been unable to get off dead center. Meanwhile, the problem is growing increasingly difficult and some developments have made control almost impossible. Soviet intransigence has on many past occasions tended to exonerate us before the bar of world opinion, but the threat of modern warfare remains. Our problem is not merely to win a debate or to gain the support of world opinion – it is how to achieve a solution that will prevent world catastrophe." – *from the report of the National Planning Association, "Strengthening the Government for Arms Control."*

Staffing the Studies

A small but promising beginning has been made. John J. McCloy, former Chase Manhattan Bank chairman, is an admirable choice to head up a new disarmament committee. Paul H. Nitze, former head of policy planning, who has been named Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, is also well suited to fulfill his special mandate from Mr. Kennedy to play a role in disarmament policy; it is about time that the Pentagon, which has so heavy a stack of this country's military experts, held a *creative* role in disarmament discussions, and Mr. Nitze's assignment seems to assure this.

With increased staff in the State Department and the Pentagon given to disarmament studies, as well as increased staff at the Atomic Energy Commission for this purpose, and top level coordination under Mr. McCloy the government can begin serious policy planning. If it is decided to change the organizational structure afterward, recommendations can be made then. There is no hurry. The time for rush responses to Soviet blandishments and threats should be past.

There is, however, one disquieting note in the reported preparations thus far. It has been indicated that Mr. McCloy does not plan to move to Washington, but will commute from his New York residence. This is wrong. Disarmament is no more a task for part-time technicians than it is for amateurs, and responsibility in this should be firmly centered on one man. One can guess that Mr. McCloy will soon change his plans.

Having said all this, one can only add that no disarmament policy can succeed if it is not supported by powerful, visible military and economic force. The hints of the outgoing Administration that it may be necessary to reduce US forces overseas and its panicky efforts to protect the dollar abroad create an image of weakness, regardless of how expedient these measures may be. It cannot be assumed that disarmament will come about merely if we demonstrate our "real conviction" that it is desirable. Negotiations have a chance of succeeding only if we demonstrate that they are in the interest of the Communists – Soviet and Chinese – as well as ourselves. To do this takes time; it takes knowing what we are doing, and showing that we know.

JACK RAYMOND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paying for Better Education

by Christopher Jencks

My first thought on finishing *Taxes for the Schools* was to wonder why an author who opposes centralized government, professionalized bureaucracies, progressive schools, and other 20th Century nuisances, should want to levy taxes for education at all. Why does he not advocate a real return to free enterprise, with schools paid for by the people who use and benefit from them? All that would be needed would be a substantial fund of risk capital, from which students could borrow varying amounts according to their mental "credit rating," to spend on their own education. If each student invested his own money in his own schooling, sociologists and economists agree that the great majority would more than recover their expenditures, and would be able to repay their capital and still show a profit. The handful who failed to profit from their education in this tangible way would have to write off their education as a poor investment, but arrangements could easily be made to spread the cost of such bankruptcies among their more successful classmates, or perhaps among the teachers and schools which failed to make them productive.

Taxes for the Schools
by Roger A. Freeman
(Institute for Social Research; $5)

Since the only limit on a school's charges under such a system would be its ability to convince students that their investment would eventually "pay off," most of the fiscal problems with which Roger Freeman's book deals would evaporate. Unfortunately, as Freeman sadly notes, free enterprise seems to be pretty dead outside higher education. The National Defense Education Act may have made loans available to college men, but a proposal to extend this system to secondary schools would rouse a furor. For better or worse, therefore, Freeman resigns himself to the fact that we must live with "socialized education," even if this intellectual welfare state makes the young into wards of a school over which they have no choice for 12 years, and gives them the impression that learning is a public rather than a personal responsibility.

For Freeman, a former member of Eisenhower's staff, acceptance of public responsibility for the schools has a further consequence: acceptance of taxes to pay for them. Yet one cannot help wondering. Is it either reasonable or politic to make the older generation pay for schools whose benefits will not be reaped until they are under ground? Is this not perhaps asking too much of altruism? Might it not be more sensible to finance education out of long-term bonds, to be redeemed when the children who had benefited from the loan grew up into taxpayers? Surely if school budgets were set by the young "investing in themselves," instead of the old "investing in the future," there would be less tendency to penuriousness? Alas, though, no Eisenhower economic moralist can accept such an irresponsible scheme to "mortgage our future." (In Freeman's textbook public borrowing is always inflationary.)

Since free enterprise is impractical, and deficit financing is immoral, the only way to provide schools is to give the students something for nothing by having their parents foot the bill. Taxpayers do not like to play Santa Claus, but so far as Freeman is concerned they have no choice. He is especially stern with those taxpayers who think they can evade their responsibilities by shifting the expense to some minority which does not include themselves. In the days when government was relatively small, he says, it was possible to finance it with progressive income taxes of "the rich," corporation taxes on "business," and tariffs on "foreigners." But today federal, state and local governments spend a dollar for every two dollars of private expenditure, and the only people who can supply funds are the vast numbers of middle-income families who hold the bulk of America's wealth. Corporation taxes, which the naïve still imagine come out of stockholder's pockets, are in Freeman's view (not universally accepted) passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices. In other words, they are paid mostly by middle-income families. Likewise, Freeman warns, even complete confiscation of all income above $25,000 would leave the bulk of the tax bill for middle-income families. For the very rich and the very poor, whether we emphasize property and sales taxes, or income taxes, makes a difference. But for most of us the difference is trivial, usually less than one percent of our income in one direction or the other. Our only real choice is which pocket we will pay from. Some like the money deducted from the weekly paycheck, while others like it added to consumer prices. Yet on one thing all seem agreed: it should not be charged as a single lump sum, in the form of "property tax." Nevertheless, Freeman argues, there are stringent economic and political reasons for continuing to base school finance on this unpopular tax.

The economic reasons are derived from Freeman's analysis of American economic and tax history. Up to 1929 the bulk of public spending was done by state and local agencies, and the bulk of public monies was raised from property taxes. During the New Deal a national crisis led to a shift in the balance of government power towards Washington, and a "soak the rich" philosophy led to increasing reliance on progressive income taxes. This trend was accelerated during the war, when heavy production of untaxable military assets meant that taxable income was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growing much faster than taxable property. The return to a peacetime economy meant, however, a reversion to the "normal" pattern of economic growth, in which national wealth increased faster than national income. Since progressive income taxes were already operating at "capacity," it was natural that postwar demand for public services should focus on state and local governments, which could exploit a now rapidly-growing tax base by levying sales and property taxes. These taxes have increased steadily in the last 15 years, but America still relies more on income tax revenue than any other industrial country in the world, including those run by socialists. Property taxes have climbed since 1945, but only slightly faster than real property values. They are still the only American tax whose effective rate is lower than it was in 1929. Freeman concludes that if any tax has "exhausted its potential," it is the income, not the property tax, and if any level of government has overstrained its resources, it is the federal government with its vast debt and international commitments, not state and local governments which, despite rapid postwar growth, are relatively better off than a generation ago.

This is hardly an orthodox position, and it requires some amplification. What of the "federalists" who claim that property taxes are "limited" by their inability to touch intangible property, or that such taxes bear unfairly on the property-owning minority, or respond inadequately to inflation, or are kept down by interstate and intercommunity competition? Freeman gives "intangible property" short shrift, pointing out that all untaxable intangible property is merely a symbol for real property, which is taxable somewhere else. It may irk the Chicago school board that it cannot levy taxes on the mining stocks held by Chicago residents, but there is plenty of taxable real estate in Chicago, and the mines are paying property taxes in Colorado. To say that the property tax is limited because it does not tax "intangible" property is, he believes, like saying that the income tax is "limited" because it only taxes wealth when its owner puts it to productive use.

Neither has Freeman got much time for those who claim that property taxes are paid only by a minority. Everyone, he says, lives somewhere, and even if he does not own his home, he pays property taxes in the form of rents. Admittedly, since the poor devote a larger share of their income to housing than the rich, the tax bears slightly more heavily on them, but the effect of even the heaviest property taxes is overwhelmingly offset by the progressivity of the income tax.

For those who complain that property taxes do not respond to inflation, Freeman notes that construction costs have been inflated twice as fast as other costs, and that property values have increased faster than incomes in most areas. He admits, of course, that *assessed* property values may lag behind during inflationary periods, but he argues that the remedy for this is to abandon locally elective assessors subject to community pressures, relying instead on professional assessors from some state agency. Such men could keep the tax base at its current true value, and would thereby effectively repeal legal limits on taxation which now cramp some school boards.

As for the argument that communities cannot raise their property taxes as high as they would like for fear that business will not immigrate, or perhaps emigrate, Freeman cites considerable expert evidence that choice of business sites is more often determined by the quality of local public services, and especially the availability of labor than by the tax rate. Certainly the experience of states like California would support his claim that high taxes are no deterrent to migrant business if they produce an economically more viable community.

Such an argument is not, of course, wholly dispassionate. Having claimed that the states have greater tax resources than the federal government (since they can tax property, sales, *and* income, instead of just income), Freeman is not slow to conclude that school finance should be kept out of federal hands. To pin the hope for additional funds on Washington is to guarantee inadequate schools, he argues, for Congress cannot possibly provide the additional billion dollars each year needed to maintain the present pace of expansion and improvement. Admittedly inflation and rising personal incomes will move the majority of taxpayers into higher tax brackets during the sixties and hence federal revenues will grow slightly faster than national income unless Congress pursues its historical penchant for extending new exemptions to such groups as farmers, homeowners, mineral prospectors, and other worthies. But if President Kennedy is to keep his pledges for an expanded military establishment, and for federal help to such deprived groups as urban slum dwellers, coal miners, and the aged, he is going to have no more than one or two billion dollars a year left over for education, even by 1968. And a million or two is not going to make much dent in the $22 billion bill the schools will then be incurring, according to Freeman's estimates, much less in the $30 billion bill the National Education Association plans.

Even the advocates of more public expenditure, of which Freeman certainly is not one, may well conclude from reading his book that if current projections of the federal budget are accurate, Mr. Kennedy would be well advised to drop his plans for school support and concentrate on jobs which the state and local governments either cannot or will not do. After all, without federal action haven't out schools managed to provide a steadily improved school plant, now the best in the world and the best in American history, and have also raised teachers' salaries faster than most other people's, and far faster than most other public employees'? The NEA does talk of a "crisis," and produces figures about huge shortages of classrooms and teachers, but these "shortages" are the result of setting

"LET EISENHOWER HAVE *peace. Let him have peace, even though he has brought neither peace nor hope to the millions of slaves around the world to whom he once spoke of liberation. Let him have peace, even though our own soldiers—we think of the RB-47 fliers who are captive in Soviet prisons—are abandoned. We pray he will never realize what a total, desperate failure he was, compared with what he might have been. We would not wish to visit so bitter a preception on any man, let alone a good man.*"

From the current issue of NATIONAL REVIEW. Write to Dept. R-8, 150 E. 35 St., New York 16, N. Y., for free copy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standards for school operation which have never prevailed in the past, or elsewhere in the world. Thus when the NEA tells us that we are short 70,000 (or is it 170,000, or 270,000?) teachers, the layman conjures up an image of pupils sitting unminded in their classes. The truth is that these statistics merely indicate that the NEA would like the steadily improving ration of teachers to students to improve even faster, and defines any failure to meet its optimal standard as a "shortage."

But of course the economic case for federal aid to the schools does not rest solely on the argument that the property and sales tax are inadequate.

Freeman's case turns out to be fundamentally political. If the poor states were asking for federal help for their schools, it would be hard to deny them, but they aren't. On the contrary, they are adamantly opposed to the whole idea, and insist that if federal taxes are kept down they can take care of themselves quite well. Of the 32 governors who offered their views on federal school aid to Congress in 1959, only five were favorable; they were liberal governors like Orville Freeman and G. Mennen Williams. Certainly neither Minnesota nor Michigan stands to benefit most from federal action, for being relatively richer states they could pay more than their share.

Furthermore, poor Southerners afraid of integration are not the only people who oppose federal aid. The National School Boards Association has repeatedly opposed it, only three state legislatures evidently favor it, and a majority of governors even in the liberal North are for continuing local finance, not to mention Cardinal Spellman. The only people who consistently favor federal action are educators of various sorts. It is they who proclaim property taxes antiquated, state and local financing bankrupt, and federal action the only alternative to national disaster. To a conservative like Freeman, their motives are obvious and wrong. The educators do not like property taxes because these taxes are subject to local approval and limitation. They claim state and local taxation is deficient because state and local politicians refuse to give them as much money as they want. Frustrated locally, they turn to Congress.

No doubt this strategy makes a good deal of sense, for Congressmen on the whole are better educated than state and local politicians, and more responsive to the idea that school teachers should be paid as well as lawyers, and that school buildings should be no more austere than supermarkets. Yet, as Freeman says, the success of such an appeal would in effect be a direct veto of local decisions about how much money the schools need, and would mean the end of local control, no matter how the "support" was distributed. "To suggest that states, communities, and the people themselves are competent to direct educational policies and to spend the monies but are unable to judge the size of the funds which the schools need to carry out those policies (or are unwilling to raise them) is illogical and inconsistent."

So it is. And as a postscript one might add that to suggest that the people are incapable of determining school policies is to raise serious questions as to just what they are capable of determining. If schools are best left to educators, then is not government best left to politicians, and war to generals? There are those, including myself, who reject such logic, but our position is not easy to defend.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that Freeman's political case against federal support of the schools is more tenuous than his economic case. Rhetorically he asks, "Is it suggested that the extent and nature of the shortages and shortcomings can be seen and evaluated more clearly in Washington than in the communities where the schools are? Or that Congress must set itself up as the guardian of America's children who cannot be left to the mercy of their parents?" To those of us who believe that the National Defense Education Act was as necessary to protect local school boards from their own myopia as the Child Labor Act was to protect parents from their own poverty, the answer to both questions is a resounding "Yes!" It is not of course suggested that *all* shortages are more visible in Washington than Dubuque, but would not Mr. Freeman admit that *some* problems are national?

No community thinks it has a shortage of people familiar with foreign cultures. No school board will, on its own initiative, get very agitated about newspaper reports that the State Department and overseas business corporations have trouble finding competent personnel. Similarly, no community has a shortage of theoretical physicists. And if it did, there would be nothing much even the most aroused school board could do, for an adequate supply of such men depends on *every* school developing the gifts of the one or two geniuses that come its way in a lifetime. Since such nationally important talents rarely remain in the communities where they were educated, school boards have almost no direct incentive to worry about the problem. Does Mr. Freeman really believe that without the incentive of the NDEA 50 state legislatures and 50,000 school boards would have got together to try to improve our methods of selecting, encouraging, and training nationally essential experts? Does he really think that expenditures for "research and development," which he himself says the education business so badly needs in order to improve its productivity, can ever be financed locally? Isn't this rather like waiting for the local filling station to finance research on petroleum production?

Mr. Freeman has made a convincing case that the federal government cannot and should not assume major responsibility for the schools, but he has failed to convince at least one reader that the US Office of Education should not continue to support research, specialized curricula, and other nationally important programs which local authorities persistently slight. Nor would it do anyone any harm, including the taxpayers, if Mr. Kennedy were to double or treble present federal allotments for education to perhaps a billion dollars annually.

Now You Can Show the Classics of WORLD CINEMA in Your Home, Club and School!
SHOW the GREAT FILMS of ALL THE NATIONS!
LA STRADA · BICYCLE THIEF
3 PENNY OPERA · RED BALLOON
ALEXANDER NEVSKY · IKIRU
CARNIVAL IN FLANDERS, 400 OTHERS
$1 for 210 pg. CATALOG No. 26 (cost deducted from 1st order)
BRANDON FILMS, 200 W. 57 St. New York 19, Dept. NR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Political What's What

by William Lee Miller

"Realism" in political thinking today sometimes goes too far. It's a little like the old southern distinction between the "truth" and the "sho' nuff" truth: many of us seem to be underlining the fact that we are sho' nuff really realistic realists, and one may feel that in the emphasis we protest too much. The insistence may spring from our being in reaction against a position found around us. We may be overreacting against the "idealistic" and "moralistic" and "individualistic" notions in the populace and in older theories, and we may then sometimes make too much of a Thing out of "power" and "interest." Making the "national interest" the sole criterion of foreign policy may be an example; making the pressure group the central fact of domestic politics may be another.

The Semisovereign People
A Realist's View
of Democracy in America
by E. E. Schattschneider
(Holt, Rinehart & Winston; $2.95)

Mr. Schattschneider, described in the subtitle of this book as a "realist," has been for decades an influential teacher of American politics. He has had the interest in the concrete pushes and pulls of contemporary affairs that marks much of American political science, especially that part of it that deals with parties and pressure groups. At the same time, however, he has had that interest without losing an optimistic awareness of the real stuff of human purpose out of which politics is made. He does not see American politics to be only a squabble among narrowly self-interested pressure groups or a world simply of power balancing other power. He sees the search by human beings in conflict for the support of majorities. Mr. Schattschneider has set himself, perhaps in general as in this book, to attack "all political theories, all research techniques and concepts tending to show that American politics is a meaningless stalemate about which no one can do anything." In this attack, he has developed an enthusiastic understanding of the majority-seeking parties and of the two-party system that was reflected not only in his own earlier book "Party Government," but in the report of the American Political Science Association dealing with that subject. Better than anyone else he has seen the merit of the two-party system by which competing party leaders seek majority support; he has seen the difference between the party and the pressure group and the importance of the former.

His is a "realism" that is not systematically negative and reductionistic and Hobbesian, but rather inclusive and discriminate, aware both of interests and of ideals, and of the different ways they appear under different organization. Most significant fights in American politics today are not fights between narrow interests but fights between contending definitions of the common good, and the parties are a better organization of that conflict than is the pressure group.

Although Mr. Schattschneider suggests that he is working on new theory, one encounters again many of his characteristic themes. He emphasizes the *scope* of the conflict: that is, the size of the public engaged in it. Different publics and differing "scope" make for a different outcome. He indicates the importance of the choice of the conflict that absorbs our attention: we move now, for example, from older conflicts over sectional economic rivalries to the newer conflicts over the interpretation of foreign policy. When one conflict supplants another, the population is divided again in a new way. Mr. Schattschneider emphasizes here also, as he has before in this journal, the "nationalization of politics": the subordination of the sectional and regional and local issues, and the rise of issues that involve the entire national public. He has some rather extreme words about the importance of the nonvoting 40 million Americans, which to me are not very convincing or illuminating. Perhaps most important, he emphasizes at the end that we make a mistake if we begin with a textbook definition of democracy and then look at the present American politics to find that – alas – it doesn't fit that definition. Instead we should look at the political society as it is, and measure its merits and faults. We should not expect detailed public participation; rather we should rejoice that there are competing parties and policies among which the public may choose. Mr. Schattschneider thinks what we need is a new "definition" of democracy, correcting the older ones he rather too easily dismisses; perhaps what we need rather is patience and care and – well – "realism," in assessing the existing political system.

This is not a very weighty book, nor does it by any means contain a complete theory. It is a suggestive essay or set of essays that indicate some aspects of a point of view. This "realist" does not make American politics an example of social physics in which blind forces pull at each other. He sees it as a very mixed and human enterprise, full of conflicting purposes but also of great possibilities, which it "really" is.

JOBS ABROAD

For teachers, writers, librarians, translators, stenographers and administrators. Top salaries paid by American and foreign companies, governmental and international organizations. How, when and where to apply, $2.00. Money-back guarantee. Included free, "Student Opportunities Abroad." M. Dorf, 186 Covington Lane, Woodbury, N. J.

"Is it possible that in one year 'The Carlton Miscellany' has become the best magazine in the United States?" So spoke a recent contributor to the "Miscellany," who thought it was possible. He was prejudiced. Contributors to the Winter Issue include: Howard Nemerov, Erling Larsen, Reed Whittemore, Robert Lax, Jack Ludwig, Donald Hall, Verlin Cassill, Robert Lowry, Ramon Guthrie and others. For a year's subscription send $3.50:

THE CARLETON MISCELLANY
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota

Notes on Contributors

Christopher Jencks, *a contributing editor of* The New Republic, *is spending the winter in England.* William Lee Miller *is a member of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOVIES

Uncrabbed Age and Youth

The chief question raised by the film of Shaw's *The Millionairess* is why it was filmed at all. This is not to derogate the play, which has already been overderogated. But of all the great dramatists, Shaw is surely one of the least filmable, and this play one of the least filmable in Shaw.

His later plays – those after *Saint Joan*

The Millionairess
(20th Century-Fox)
Where the Boys Are (MGM)
The Love Game
(Films Around the World)

– are often discounted as the self-amusements of a dotard, and they are, admittedly, less carefully made than his earlier work, more cavalier towards useful theatrical convention. But in their distillation, their refined abstraction, their sometimes homophonic development of a theme, they resemble latter-day intellectual versions of medieval morality plays. The four acts of *The Millionairess* are like four thinly connected episodes of a comic journey. Characterization is no deeper than in *Everyman*, structure as arbitrary and exegetic; but as in *Everyman* and similar works, that structure is decorated with spirited solos and ensemble numbers. For whatever powers declined in the older Shaw (the chief decline seems to have been in attention-span), he never lost his power to write dialogue that speaks itself off the printed page or the power to make topsy-turvy comedy out of the juxtaposition of logic and human behavior. Those who still believe the myth of the sexless Shaw can read Epifania's proposal speech, which ends: "What do the unmarried know of this infinitely dangerous, heart-tearing, everchanging life of adventure that we call marriage?" Written, if you please, by this bloodless man at the age of 79.

Faced, for some reason, with the need to make a film of this play, the adapter, Riccardo Aragno, and the screenwriter, Wolf Mankowitz, have chosen what is probably the best course: they have read the original carefully and then largely disregarded it. They have retained the driving character of the heroine (based by Shaw on Lady Astor) and have also retained, in altered form, the sweatshop sequence (based by Shaw on a youthful adventure of Beatrice Webb's); they have retained the Moslem doctor (transformed understandably from Egyptian to Indian). From these elements and some other Shavian remnants, they have concocted a party-punch by adding healthy dollops of Technicolor extravaganza, Marx Brothers farrago, and stunning fashion show. The punch is not Shavian wine, but neither is it insipid.

Sophia Loren could not be Shaw's heroine but here that is irrelevant. She is forceful, flashing, fascinating; and the picture is almost worth seeing simply to watch her wear the prodigal number of superb dresses that Balmain has made for her. Miss Loren is much more than a clothes-horse; still it is nothing against her that she is the most beautiful woman now on the screen.

Peter Sellers gives another excellent performance as the Indian doctor. He demonstrates again that he can imitate the sounds made by anyone; but, among other things, he seems to lack sufficient interest in acting to be compelling. So far he has given us a series of astounding facsimiles.

Alastair Sim, Dennis Price, and Vittorio De Sica (wasted) are also present. Something of Shaw's theme filters through: *viz.*, how is society to control and to make use of those individuals who have the power to dominate; and even though you may ask yourself from time to time what the damned thing *is*, you will probably find the picture entertaining.

Where the Boys Are is an American comedy dealing with the annual Easter vacation pilgrimage of thousands of college students to the Florida beaches, where boys go to meet girls and *vice* is very much *versa*. Middle-class morality is here isolated and magnified. The boys want the most with the least obligation; the girls want maximum attention without losing their Most Precious Possession. Well, if the idea sounds revolting to you, the picture didn't invent it – it was taken from contemporary mythology. The script, which follows the escapades of four girls, is written in jaunty rhinestone dialogue, and the picture is helped by the bloom of two newcomers named Dolores Hart and Paula Prentiss.

Alongside this film let us place a recent French picture called *The Love Game*, directed by Philippe de Broca, who is 28. This is the first comedy of the "New Wave" and, to me, is one of the most original works which that rather disappointing wave has produced. The American film has at least four plots; the French film can scarcely be said to have one. It deals with a Parisian boy and girl who live behind their curio shop and, to make an attempt at drama, it includes another boy who lives across the street and is a quasi-threat to their happiness. But the object of the picture is merely to convey how these two young people feel at various times: elated, jealous, suddenly depressed, and so on. There is a sequence of some minutes in which they simply cavort about their shop after a bit of good news and which is one of the most charming things to appear on film in years. Jean-Pierre Cassel and Geneviève Cluny (who supplied the idea for the film) make you a little jealous not to be their age and (according to your sex) in the slippers of one or the other.

At the end these two people, whom we have often seen in bed, are on their way to be married. But let us avoid facile comparisons with *Where The Boys Are*. For one thing, we are all a bit tired of comparisons between Continental worldliness and American puritanism. For another, these comparisons are, usually, falsely based. Middle-class morality is virtually and virtuously the same everywhere. Anyone who acted on the belief that all American youths behave like those in the MGM film and that all French youths behave like those in *The Love Game* would be in for some pleasant and unpleasant surprises.

STANLEY KAUFFMANN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THEATER

The Enormous Sum of Zero

Rhinoceros
by Eugene Ionesco
(Longacre Theater)

In Molière's *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, a Cartesian philosopher tries, by logical demonstration, to instruct his unlettered patron in the theory behind actions he has always performed by instinct. After praising that moral philosophy which teaches you to moderate your passions according to ancient scientific principles, the philosopher then loses his temper utterly, getting embroiled in a battle royal with three other narrow specialists who question the validity of his function. The moral is this: the unconditioned man is wiser than the learned philosopher, scientific theory falsifies human experiences, and every systematic thinker harbors dangerous destructive impulses beneath his apparently ordered surface.

Molière's 20th Century disciple is Eugene Ionesco who – noting that "scientific" political movements like Nazism offered contemporary proof of his master's axioms – not only adapted this short interlude in *The Lesson* but made its moral central to his entire work. In *Rhinoceros*, he has not varied his theme; he has merely found another form through which to express it.

The form he has selected here is social parable whereby a simple idea is embodied in a complex poetic metaphor. As the central character (an alcoholic, unkempt anti-hero named Berenger) watches in shocked horror, the inhabitants of a small provincial town are gradually turning into rhinos. First to go are those most fully committed to Society or System: Berenger's conventional friend, John, who speaks perpetually of the need for will power and moral strength; a pedantic Logician who confronts all natural phenomena armed with the weapons of syllogistic logic (thus proving that Socrates was a cat); a Marxist-Unionist who presumably wishes to replace the existing social order with an even more rigid one; and sundry officials, lawyers, romantics, and government authorities. The rhino pack symbolizes "community spirit triumphing over anarchic impulses" – in other words, a kind of collective insanity, similar to the total conformity of Nazism, by which the mildest rationalists are transformed into raging, violent, thundering, trumpeting beasts. Only Berenger remains immune to this metamorphosis, for he is a special misfit, committed to nothing but pursuing his own harmless pleasures. At the end, the whole world has gone over to the rhinos and he is left totally alone, musing on the sad fate of the non-conformist ("People who hang on to their individuality always come to a bad end"). Half inclined to join the pack but now unable to change, he finally determines to pit his weak powers against an increasingly mad society.

Since *Rhinoceros* contains a number of delightful scenes, and dramatizes an idea which, with a little less paranoic tenacity, I hold myself, I feel almost churlish in adding that there is not enough nourishment here for a full length play. In a short farce like *The Bald Soprano*, Ionesco could hold our attention with his deft annihilation of language, logic, and cliché, for he possesses a unique gift for manipulating the absurd which makes him an uncanny comedian. In his longer works, however, his farcical gifts are suppressed in favor of expanded intellectual allegories, designed for social commentary rather than comic invention. Ionesco obviously thinks a great deal, mostly about the futility of conceptual thought, but his intellect strikes me as the weakest of his faculties. I suspect he was once, like the old Groucho Marx, an instinctual anarchist; then read Antonin Artaud and the French Existentialists who converted him to the *philosophy* of the absurd, a far different thing. No longer content to be purely destructive, he is now defending this philosophy in more conventional (and tedious) dramatic form, and so runs the risk of becoming a bit

A nation—to be or not to be?

Read *Selig S. Harrison's*

INDIA:

THE MOST DANGEROUS DECADES

Can India survive as a unified, free nation? This lucid book appraises the present position of the most influential "neutral" power in the world today and indicates what the years immediately ahead may hold in store for her. "A most valuable contribution."—CHARLES BURTON MARSHALL $6.50

At all bookstores

Princeton University Press

Princeton, New Jersey

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a Cartesian ideologist himself. For unlike Shaw – another dramatist who attacked System from a highly systematic position – Ionesco possesses neither sufficient complexity nor enough command of dialectic to write a play of ideas; and *Rhinoceros*, for all its intermittent power, finally suffers from a certain impoverishment of mind.

Joseph Anthony has chosen to slice great hunks of fatty abstrusity off this work and direct it as if it were a Marx Brothers romp. Ordinarily, I would feel compelled to defend the author's interests; here I can only applaud the director's wisdom and perspicacity. Anthony's production is distinguished by its swift pace and orchestrated style, and particularly by its generous supply of ingenious business, all of which might have been more impressive if executed properly – but few of the actors, alas, have mastered burlesque technique. The great exception is, of course, Zero Mostel as John who justifies the entire evening by contributing another of his extraordinary histrionic creations. When he first enters Leo Kerz's pastel set, fastidiously wrapped in a bulging morning suit and double-breasted vest, his moustache elegantly waxed, his few strands of hair plastered forward on his head like seaweed, the lyric grossness of his physical presence is a marvelous sight gag; but he proceeds to demonstrate that he has a great dancer's control of movement, a great actor's control of voice, a great mime's control of facial expression as well. The gracefulness with which he executes a Chaplinesque back-kick; the ease with which he shifts his emotions from calm to fury to bafflement; and above all the rapidity with which he transforms himself into a rhino before your eyes, thickening his features, hoarsening his voice, chomping his leg impatiently on the floor – these are the moments that make you believe implicitly in the world of this play, for by some improbable magic Mostel has filled his slender outlines and expanded it into art. Most of the others have not been so fortunate. After spending the first two acts playing straight man to Mostel, Eli Wallach finally turns Berenger into a pathetic and appealing little idealist who has wandered into Ionesco's world by mistake; and Anne Jackson suspends his girl friend, Daisy, somewhere between caricature and reality, unable to make a hearty leap in either direction.

But the play also hangs in a state of suspense, too intellectually anti-intellectual to be completely persuasive. An inept performance of *The Killer* last season convinced me then that Ionesco did not have the artistic stamina to write an effective three act play; *Rhinoceros* (its sequel) confirms me in this view, but I am much less dour about it now. For the play enables Zero Mostel to demonstrate once again that he is a very great actor; and if the sum of the work were only Zero, this alone would be an ample sum indeed.

ROBERT BRUSTEIN

EUROPE

We'll see the usual plus Russia, Scandinavia, Yugoslavia & N. Africa. A different trip—for the young in spirit who don't want to be herded around. Also shorter trips. Budget priced.

EUROPE SUMMER TOURS
255 Sequoia, Box N — Pasadena, California

L'EXPRESS

The leading liberal newspaper in France today.
Send 10¢ for your sample copy.
Howard Publications
Room 503
1475 Broadway
New York 36, N.Y.

AFRIQUE-ACTION
The liberal voice of emerging Africa.
Edited in Tunis, in French. Ask for your free copy.
HOWARD PUBLICATIONS
Room 503, 1475 Broadway, New York 36

"HAVE YOU OUTGROWN GODS, SAVIORS AND SUPERNATURALISM?
Is all your concern for people? Then welcome to the ranks of HUMANISTS. We cordially invite you to join the AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION; we have local chapters, publications. Send $1 for three month special trial membership (or $5 for year) to:
AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION
Dept. NR, Yellow Springs, Ohio

LET SOME CHILD LOVE YOU

You or your group can "adopt" a needy child, through Foster Parents Plan. You will receive photographs, a history of "your child", monthly letters and the greatest gift of all, a child's love.
For information write to:
Foster Parents' Plan, Inc.
352 Park Ave., South • N.Y.C. 10, N.Y., Dept. 3

POLITICAL RESEARCH
American Oxonian, young woman, strong background in politics and economics, graduate work philosophy; writing ability, types; seeks post as political assistant or researcher.
Write Box 40, The New Republic, 1244 19th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Any Book

Out-of-print books located—no matter how old or long out-of-print. Name the book—we'll find it for you! (Title alone is sufficient.) All authors, subjects. Fiction, nonfiction. No obligation.
Books-On-File
Dept. NEW Union City, N.J.

EXPERIMENT WITH "SLEEP-LEARNING"
Self-hypnosis. Use your phonograph, recorder. Fascinating, educational. Details free.
Sleep-Learning Research Association
Box 24-NR Olympia, Washington

WE MOVE YOU WITHOUT TEARS
Economical, insured moving and storage vans, wagons—NYC, resorts, long distance
AL 5-8343
The Padded Wagon, Inc. New York, N. Y.

ATHEISTS! AGNOSTICS! FREETHINKERS!
THE SECULARIST is a dynamic monthly magazine for you. Annual subscription-membership: $3. American Secularist Ass'n., Box 91-NR, Newark 1, New Jersey.

ATTORNEY DESIRES POSITION
in industry or business primarily; age 31, member of the California Bar for two years; Los Angeles area; resume of experience sent upon request; Box 30, New Republic, 1244 19th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $10.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order Money back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

MAKE YOUR WILL!
Two approved Will Forms and simple "Instruction Guide," $1.00.
National Forms, Box 48313NR,
Los Angeles 48, Calif.

RATIONALISTS! AGNOSTICS! HUMANISTS!
THE OPEN MIND is a new militant and informative monthly freethinking magazine for open-minded individuals. 6 months trial subscription is $1.00. THE OPEN MIND, Dept. NR, 55 Orchard Street, Newark, N. J.

VACATIONS
The place for civilized people in Miami Beach (if that's not a contradiction in terms) is the Venetian Isle Resort Motel,
20 Venetian Way Miami Beach 39, Fla.,
JEfferson 8-7261

WRITERS! REQUEST FREE sample Pink Sheets listing markets USA. Literary Agent Mead, 915 Broadway, New York.

LIVE IN A STIMULATING COMMUNITY!
Modern Community Developers offers homes in well planned, intelligently integrated communities in Philadelphia area; Princeton, N.J.; Waterbury and Stamford, Conn.; Wilmington, Del. Co-op apartments available in Riverdale, Brooklyn and Bronx, N.Y.C. Write M.C.D., 84 Nassau, Princeton, N.J., or phone Stuart Wallace, Princeton – WAlnut 4-0701.

SUPPORT OLD AGE AID
SOCIAL SECURITY
MEDICAL CARE
WRITE TO YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Printed by National Publishing Co., 301 N St., N.E., Washington 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHERE TO RETIRE ON A SMALL INCOME

This book selects out of the hundreds of thousands of communities in the U. S. and its island territories only those places where living costs are less, where the surroundings are pleasant, and where nature and the community get together to guarantee a good time from fishing, boating, gardening, concerts, or the like. The book never overlooks the fact that some people must get part-time or seasonal work to pad out their income.

It covers cities, towns, and farms throughout America – from New England south to Florida, west to California and north to the Pacific Northwest. It includes both Hawaii and American Virgin Islands. Some people spend hundreds of dollars trying to get information like this by traveling around the country. Frequently they fail – there is just too much of America to explore!

Where to Retire on a Small Income saves you from that danger. Yet the big NEW edition costs only $1.00.

ALL ABOUT ARIZONA

—the healthful state, where it's great to live and vacation

Just as a road map shows you how to reach your destination, Thomas B. Lesure's big book, *All About Arizona, the healthful state*, leads you to whatever you want in this fast growing state of sun and scenic wonderlands.

What do you want to know about Arizona?

Where's the best place to retire at low cost? Where are summers cool? Winters, sunny most of the time? Where are the best areas for a job or a business of your own? For a home? What must a newcomer watch out for when buying land . . . or a home? How high are taxes? Is it true that living costs are less than in the East? What about salaries . . . schools for my children . . . my health?

Or do you want to tour this Grand Canyon State? What's the best way to see Arizona by car (or otherwise)? What is really worth seeing along the roads and down interesting side roads? Or in the cities, the national parks and the other four-star sights? What are those world-famous but relatively unknown four-star sights overshadowed by spectacular Grand Canyon? What is really the best way to see the Grand Canyon? The Indian reservations? The other Canyons? Which are the best places to eat and stay along the way?

What are the sure ways to cut travel costs in this big state?

Filled with facts, over a hundred thousand words in length, *All About Arizona, the healthful state*, almost brings Arizona to your door, answering these and a hundred other questions and giving you a richer, better picture of Arizona than many people have after living there for years.

To know all you should about Arizona before you go for a home, a job, a business of your own, retirement in the sun, or a vacation you'll always remember, read *All About Arizona, the healthful state*. Price Only $2.

BARGAIN PARADISES OF THE WORLD

Do you know where to find an island right near the U. S. – so nearly like Tahiti in appearance, beauty and color, even the natives say it was made from a rainbow? (And the costs here are so low you cannot only reach it but also stay awhile for hardly more than you'd spend at a resort in the U. S.?)

Do you know where to find the world's best mountain hideaways or its most dazzling surf-washed coastal resorts, where even today you can live for a song?

Do you know where it costs less to spend awhile, the surroundings are pleasant, and the climate well nigh perfect in such places as Mexico, the West Indies and the world's other low cost wonderlands? Or which is the one spot world travelers call the most beautiful place on earth, where two can live in sheer luxury, with a retinue of servants, for only $175 a month?

BARGAIN PARADISES OF THE WORLD, a big new book with about 70 photos and 4 maps, proves that if you can afford a vacation in the U. S., the rest of the world is closer than you think. Author Norman D. Ford, honorary vice-president of the Globetrotters Club, shows that the American dollar is respected all over the world and buys a lot more than you'd give it credit for.

Yes, if you're planning to retire, this book shows that you can live for months on end in the world's wonderlands for hardly more than you'd spend for a few months at home or if you've dreamed of taking time out for a real rest, this book shows how you can afford it.

In any case, when it can cost as little as $24.50 from the U. S. border to reach some of the world's Bargain Paradises, it's time you learned how much you can do on the money you've got. Send now for BARGAIN PARADISES OF THE WORLD. Price $1.50. Use coupon to order.

WHERE WILL YOU GO IN FLORIDA?

FLORIDA needn't be expensive—not if you know just where to go for whatever you seek in Florida. And if there's any man who can give you the facts you want it's Norman Ford, founder of the world-famous Globetrotters Club. (Yes, Florida is his home whenever he isn't traveling.)

His big book, Norman Ford's Florida, tells you, first of all, road by road, mile by mile, everything you'll find in Florida, whether you're on vacation or looking over *job, business, real estate, or retirement prospects.*

Always he names the hotels, motels, and restaurants where you can stop for the best accommodations and meals at the price you want to pay. For that longer vacation, if you let Norman Ford guide you, you'll find a real "paradise"—just the spot which has everything you want.

Of course, there's much more to this big book.

If You Want a Job or a Home in Florida

NORMAN FORD tells you just where to head. His talks with hundreds of personnel managers, businessmen, real estate operators, state officials, etc., lets him pinpoint the towns you want to know about, if you're going to Florida for a home, a job with a future, or a business of your own. If you've ever wanted to run a tourist court or own an orange grove, he tells you today's inside story of these popular investments.

If You Want to Retire on a Small Income

NORMAN FORD tells you exactly where you can retire now on the money you've got, whether it's a little or a lot. (If you need a part time or seasonal job to help out your income, he tells you where to pick up extra income.) Because Norman Ford always tells you where life in Florida is pleasantest on a small income, he can help you to take life easy now.

Yes, no matter what you seek in Florida – whether you want to retire, vacation, get a job, buy a home, or start a business – Norman Ford's Florida gives you the facts you need to find exactly what you want. Yet this big book with plenty of maps and well over 100,000 words sells for only $2 – only a fraction of the money you'd spend needlessly, if you went to Florida blind.

For your copy, fill out coupon today.

WHAT DO YOU WANT IN CALIFORNIA?

A job or a business of your own?

A vacation to Hollywood, San Francisco, Yosemite, elsewhere in California – at a price you can afford?

A place to retire on a small income?

A home in the sun, with year-around spring-like days?

No matter what you seek in California, William Redgrave's big book *California—the State That Has Everything*, shows you city by city, town by town, road by road, everything you'll find in this big state.

If you are vacationing, his clear and detailed facts just about guarantee you won't miss anything worth seeing and you will welcome his long lists of *recommended* restaurants, motels and hotels, where you can stop *at the price you want to pay.*

If you're looking for a job or a business of your own, *California – the State That Has Everything* gives you the facts you want. With William Redgrave's help you'll find the California that appeals to you – whole regions with just the degree of warmth and sunshine you want, with houses and rentals priced within your means. If you're single, you'll find the best places to live for the fun and entertainment you want. If you're a family man, you'll find the best places to raise a family. If you want to retire, you'll find the pleasantest places in all California to live on a small income.

There's so much more to this book – the facts you need if you're thinking of living in a trailer, the best places to fish and hunt, where to go for a college education, what you'll pay in taxes, how best to find your own retirement or vacation paradise, etc., etc. There's so much information, in fact, that you probably wouldn't learn as much about California in months, even years, of traveling around this big state as you can learn from this one big book. Yet it costs only $2. Mail coupon today for your copy.

Fill Out and Send at Once for Quick Delivery

Mail to HARIAN PUBLICATIONS
121 Baron Street
Greenlawn (Long Island), New York

I have enclosed $.....(cash, check or money order). Please send me the books checked below. You will refund my money if I am not satisfied.

- ☐ All About Arizona – the healthful state. $2,
- ☐ Bargain Paradises of the World. $1.50.
- ☐ California – The State That Has Everything. $2.
- ☐ Norman Ford's Florida. $2.
- ☐ Where to Retire on a Small Income. $1.
- ☐ ***SPECIAL OFFER: All 5 books above ($8.50 value) for only $6.***

Print Name .....

Address .....

City and State .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED